

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

EXTENSION:

NO.

DATE

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

John: As I recall these same points were discussed by you or [redacted] during the "R26" Review. At any rate, prior to doing anything w/ this, please see [redacted]

Thurs

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Questions Relative to Directorate of Operations Records Disposition Programs

FROM:

1 D 27

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

14 August 1985

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

14 AUG 1985

15/8 16/8
16 Aug 85

3 to 4 x 5

Bernie has uncovered something we must take a look at. I am bothered by what appears to be a procedure(s) which should be eliminated. If you can let me know what you think take a look at and come up with recommendations. Pls have release doc this see me first. Thanks

S E C R E T

DO Division/Staff Volume of Records Requiring Review in 1987/1988
(Figures represent linear footage)

<u>Division/Staff (OPI #)</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>
LA (57)	19	435
IMS(53)	103	168
PCS(49)	6	10
CIS(45)	20	105
CCS(43)	12	28
CAS(42)	24	253
AF (41)	7	134
<input type="checkbox"/> (24)	0	143
EA (48)	132	827
NE (52)	108	330
EUR(47)	52	971
EPS(51)	0	7
DDO(40)	4	0
<input type="checkbox"/> (46)	3	47
CMS(70)	0	0
<input type="checkbox"/> (59)	0	4
<input type="checkbox"/> (44)	0	0
SE (54)	0	479
SOG(55)	19	15
<u>TOTAL FOOTAGE</u>	<u>509'</u>	<u>3,956'</u>

S E C R E T

1. We better be careful that this does not cost us our A/IMO positions - much of the justification of the A/IMO positions was based on the problems/time factors involved in retirement/distruction of records.

2. Some mention has to be made of the \$'s and positions that are in the budget which were specifically requested for the review activity.

3. Is the 201 Review Group's responsibilities to be included in the new Unit? I hope so.

4. What are the advantages of a Centralized Review Effort?

5. What will be the impact on the divisions/staffs in terms of saving them time and effort?

25X1 6. What about the impact of ~~the impact~~ of 1987 when the [] Task Force documents come up for review? What impact can we expect on the DO's workload?

General Comments:

Define Records Disposition in terms of retirement and or destruction of OPS INT, OPS ACT and 201 files.

Under Recommendations:

1. What would be the "authority" of the unit (e.g., could they destroy records w/o review by the area desks concerned)?

2. COMET DA ... remove the word "possibly" and say it will eventually provide several positions, because it will.

STAT 3. The five [] section chief positions - why did you select these?

4. Item 3 - pls spell out the functions.

5. Item 4. revise and streamline - how? and to accomplish what?

6. Item 5 pls elaborate. Why? What is to be gained?

Last Paragraph - do we really need to say "dispise?"

Background:

I have made some editorial suggestions.

The Task Force

Lets change this to read "Methodology."

Scope

The items 1 through 4 duplicate those in Recommendations, above.

Disposition Practices

1. Change PROS and CONS to Strengths and Weaknesses
2. Talented analysts is not specific enough.
3. Weaknesses:

STAT 1. Item No. 1, not enough personnel assigned where? (at the desk? In not enough A/IMO's or IMO's? - see the example I took from para D on page 5.

2. Item 3. Where does it have a low priority?

3. Item 4. Where are the antiquated procedures being followed?

4. Where are the untrained persons?

Please consider adding an item 9 that describes the bottleneck in processing documents.

C. I suggest the last three sentences be deleted.

D.

STAT 1. Who reviews the 14,000 documents?

STAT 2. Dual review - Why is retaining information that the desk has approved for destruction- this should be explained in the report.

E. "The strength in this procedure" Do you mean in the Task Force recommendations of a centralized review unit?

II Disposition Projects. Excellent idea to list them. This para need a lead-in statement such as "The following projects are those that would be handled by the New Disposition Review Unit."

Oliver

25X1

85-40
4 June 1985

25X1 MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, [REDACTED]
 FROM: Chief, [REDACTED]
 SUBJECT: SOFA - Progress Report

A. BACKGROUND

25X1 1. In November 1981, C/IMS established the guidelines for
 the reduction of inactive Subject and Operational Activity
 (SOFA) files held in [REDACTED] and the Records Center. These
 25X1 guidelines included: the establishment of a long term program
 to provide for the reduction of [REDACTED] inactive file holdings in
 both Headquarters and in Records Center; that these inactive
 files should be destroyed, if they met applicable criteria for
 destruction under the records disposition schedule; that if a
 given inactive file could not be destroyed, it would be
 reviewed for deindexing and retired to Records Center in
 accordance with the records disposition schedule; that the
 destruction or retirement process would entail IMO actions,
 25X1 decisions by DO components, and the involvement of the [REDACTED]
 analysts and [REDACTED] personnel; and finally that the first phase
 of the project would include all files closed prior to 1962.
 25X1 IMS/Records Review Group (RRG) and [REDACTED] were
 born of these guidelines. [REDACTED] designed and
 implemented a VM program called DIVAN to inventory and control
 the approximate 12,982 files that would come under the
 project.

B. PROCESSING REQUIREMENTS

1. The following is a brief description of the time consuming research and detailed processing that must take place to purge files from the system or reclassify criteria documents to other files, the major component of the SOFA project.

OR 2. Once a SOFA file has been authorized for destruction and deindexing, the analyst with the aid of the current file content list for the file, reviews each document and applies the current DO indexing criteria. Those documents containing names that do not meet indexing criteria are deindexed. Those

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

39

names meeting retention criteria are not removed from ALLSTAR and in many cases the abstract record and associated index records require updating. For example, information contained in ALLSTAR for the abstract and/or the index record(s) is incomplete and must be amended to create a more meaningful abstract or index record. The analyst is also responsible for reclassifying documents that warrant reclassification. The analysts must also account for all record copy documents missing from the file at the time the file is processed. Once all processing requirements have been completed, the file is forwarded to the area IMO for retirement.

3. The detailed procedures for processing these files are enormous. A document analyst must either memorize or have immediate access to 50 pages of playscript procedures. It takes anywhere from one week to one month for an individual SOFA file to traverse all [] processing.

25X1

C. RESOURCES

1. When the [] was established circa November 1981, it consisted of three full-time and two part-time analysts. The unit currently consists of one part-time and six full-time analysts, who are not only responsible for the [] but are also assigned a number of additional duties that are related to [] and impact on [] production statistics. To increase [] production an overtime task force was suggested to Chief, [] by Chief, [] and the former [] supervisor, it was approved and established in mid-1983. The [] overtime task force includes analysts assigned to the Special Projects Unit, as well as a number of experienced former [] analysts. Prior to new IMS guidelines governing overtime, the task force included anywhere from four to ten analysts working almost every evening and on Saturdays. The production figures cited under the STATISTICAL portion of this paper indicate that the application of overtime to the project definitely boosted production.

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

D. STATISTICS

1. Although the [] project actually began circa November 1981, statistics were not actually compiled until October 1982 and were not as complete as those that have been maintained since 1983. Given the variety of assignments each analyst has been tasked with, the daily average production figure for an individual analyst is 10 documents an hour, while the average production for overtime is around 30 documents an

25X1

C O N F I D E N T I A L

40

hour. The hourly overtime figures shown below are based on an average of \$15 an hour at time and a half.

	<u>Files Destroyed</u>	<u>Doc Reclass/Destroyed</u>	<u>Records Deindexed</u>
1983	213	1,191/7,039	24,751
1984	586 (36.75 ft.)	2,161/29,976	124,590
1985*	450 (35.54)	1,665/21,406	97,947
	<u>1,249</u>	<u>5,017 58,421</u>	<u>247,288</u>
	<u>OT Hours/Cost</u>	<u>OT Hours/Cost</u>	<u>OT Hours/Cost</u>
1983	1,192/\$16,935	1984 3,406/\$51,090	1985* 3,405/\$51,075

119,100
8,003

*1985 figures are through April.

7 mos.

E. POSITION

1. Given the many variables in this project, it is nearly impossible to forecast how long it will take to complete the [] project. In actual fact the project will never end because as each year goes by more files become eligible under the DO record schedule for review and destruction and replace the ones that were processed out during the year. As of today, there is a backlog of 67 feet of unprocessed files in []. This set of files is the only backlog we can accurately identify. The impossible figure to forecast is the number of feet of files that will become part of the [] backlog once the IMOs and desk officers review the 2,754 files that are now pending review [] and the various RMO offices.

Considering all of the above, and the fact that the [] project is a permanent function sanctioned by federal law (Agency Records Schedule), it is worth thinking about the possibility of combining all the [] functions into one branch such as []. Of course such a consolidation of resources would need additional positions, but it is very logical to think that such a new component would be more efficient and productive, as well as function with little or no overtime. I believe this very concept is the subject of an [] memo that will shortly be presented to [].

CONFIDENTIAL